

Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Watkins
Smith (NJ)	Terry	Watt (NC)
Smith (TX)	Thomas	Watts (OK)
Smith (WA)	Thornberry	Waxman
Snyder	Thune	Weiner
Souder	Thurman	Weldon (FL)
Spence	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Spratt	Tierney	Wexler
Stabenow	Toomey	Weygand
Stark	Towns	Wicker
Stearns	Traficant	Wilson
Stenholm	Turner	Wolf
Stump	Upton	Woolsey
Sununu	Velazquez	Wu
Talent	Vitter	Wynn
Tanner	Walden	Young (FL)
Tauzin	Walsh	

NAYS—56

Aderholt	Gutierrez	Pickett
Baird	Gutknecht	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Hefley	Ramstad
Borski	Hilleary	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Hilliard	Sanford
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Schaffer
Clyburn	(TX)	Stupak
Coburn	Klink	Sweeney
Costello	Kucinich	Tauscher
Crane	Lipinski	Taylor (MS)
Crowley	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dickey	McNulty	Udall (CO)
English	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
Evans	Moran (KS)	Vento
Filner	Pallone	Visclosky
Ford	Pastor	Wamp
Gillmor	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Green (TX)	Phelps	Weller

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—39

Bonior	Engel	Oberstar
Burton	Fattah	Porter
Buyer	Frost	Pryce (OH)
Camp	Gephardt	Rangel
Clay	Jefferson	Ros-Lehtinen
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Clement	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Cox	Lampson	Sessions
Cubin	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Martinez	Strickland
DeLauro	McIntosh	Whitfield
DeLay	Menendez	Wise
Dixon	Norwood	Young (AK)

□ 1048

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 334 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 334

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the overly large and enthusiastic crowd here to enjoy this debate.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend, the gentleman from south Boston and extend condolences to him with the outcome of last night's game, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded will be for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.J. Res. 71, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 and for other purposes, under a closed rule, waiving all points of order. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. It provides for one hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the previous continuing resolution expires at the end of the day on Thursday, the day after tomorrow, and a further continuing resolution is necessary to keep the government operating while Congress completes the few remaining appropriations bills that have yet to be sent to the President or have been vetoed. H.J. Res. 71 simply extends the October 21 deadline to October 29.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some may contend and I suspect what we may hear in the next hour, we are, from an historical perspective, ahead of schedule. Let me say that again. We are ahead of schedule on our appropriations work. Congress, under both Democratic and Republican majorities, regularly utilize continuing resolutions as a method of keeping the government functioning while negotiations continue. In fact, only three times, let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, only three times in the last two decades, the last 20 years, has Congress passed all 13 appropriations bills by the fiscal deadline. And, with the constraints that we are dealing with now, the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997, I think that it is very, very appropriate that we are exactly where we are.

Despite the best efforts of the President and some of the minority, we are committed to passing all of the appropriations bills without borrowing one dime of the Social Security Trust Fund, again an unprecedented issue, and this very short-term continuing resolution is necessary so that we can, in fact, achieve that very important objective.

The continuing resolution was thoroughly vetted by the joint leaderships of the House and the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations, and the White House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to sup-

port it, and I urge them to try and keep the rhetoric at as low a level as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague and my very dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very happy to hear the chairman say that we are ahead of schedule, but evidently the Republicans must have added 3 months to the calendar, because I do not know how we can be ahead of schedule on the schedule we are on.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the second continuing resolution to come before the House this year. This will enable the Federal Government to remain open until October 29, despite my Republican colleagues' inability to finish the 13 appropriation bills by the day they were due.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that appropriations bills take an enormous amount of time and an enormous amount of work, but the October 1 deadline has been in effect for years and it should not come as any surprise that these bills were supposed to have been completed and sent to the President before that day. In fact, every single fiscal year since my Republican colleagues took control of the Congress, we have had to pass continuing resolutions to keep the Federal Government open. Otherwise, the Federal Government would shut down like it did in 1995; and Mr. Speaker, the American people are not going to stand for that again.

So far, we have passed five appropriations bills that have been signed into law: Legislative branch, Transportation and Military Construction, Treasury-Postal, Energy and Water. Two await action at the White House: Agriculture and Defense. The Senate is working to pass VA-HUD. Two have already been vetoed and must be rewritten: District of Columbia and Foreign Operations. Two have yet to pass the House: Interior and Commerce-Justice. And, Mr. Speaker, one has not even been reported out of subcommittee, and that is Labor-HHS.

But, there is reason to be optimistic. Today, President Clinton has invited our Republican colleagues to join with the Democratic leaders at the White House to try to resolve some of these outstanding appropriation issues. I commend President Clinton for reaching out to my Republican colleagues, and this will be the first time they have met with the President on appropriations; and despite this late date, Mr. Speaker, I wish all of them well in their negotiations.

Although I am sorry my Republican colleagues have not finished their

work, I will support this second continuing resolution because the American people deserve a government that is open for business 24 hours a day. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indian Rocks Beach, Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has worked long and hard; he and his committee have worked long and hard.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I really had not planned to speak on the rule because I thought we might handle the rule quickly and then get to the continuing resolution, but when my dear friend from Massachusetts mentioned the fact that he disagreed with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) that the Republicans had kept the appropriations schedule on track, he said they changed the calendar by about 3 months. It was not us that did that.

I remember when the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and I were both here in 1974 when the Democrats did that. The fiscal year used to begin on July 1. They could not get the job done, despite the fact they had massive majorities in the House. So they just changed the date of the fiscal year from the first of July to the first of October.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also say to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and any others who are concerned about the pace, the House Committee on Appropriations had reported out 12 of the 13 appropriations bills before the end of July, plus the two supplementals. The only bill that we did not report out was the Labor-HHS bill. And of all of the bills we reported out, we passed them all before the August recess in the House, all but the VA-HUD bill. And the VA-HUD bill was held up out of respect for a member on the Democrat side who requested that we postpone consideration of that bill, and we were more than happy to do it. So the House has pretty much done its job on appropriations ahead of schedule.

So I just took this time to remind my very dear friend from Massachusetts that the House appropriators have done a pretty good job in keeping the train on the track and keeping it running on time. There have been some other situations that have slowed us down somewhat, but we are overcoming those too. And we are prepared, before this week is over, to have all of the conference reports on the President's desk.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear the chairman say we are ahead of schedule. If we are, what are we doing here?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), a gentleman who has a very, very good memory, and who is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the first thing we ought to do is dismiss the piece of fiction that we just heard from my good friend from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He just told this House that because the Congress could not pass a budget on time back in the 1970s, that it simply added 3 months to the fiscal year. That is absolutely, totally not true.

□ 1100

It is interesting to me how people sometimes continue believing in fictions that they themselves have invented if they repeat those fictions often enough, and I think this is one such case.

The fact is that what happened in the mid-seventies is that the Congress redrew the entire budget process and when they did that they put into motion a change that would be effective 2 years later, which would simply change the fiscal years which used to run from July to July. They simply changed it to run from October to October because Congress was not getting its budget done in July and August. That is what they did.

There was no invention of an additional 3 months, and the gentleman, if he does not understand that, certainly should.

Now, why are we here in this charade? We are here because our work is not done. This is not the first time; that is absolutely true. If we are behind, it is not the fault of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). It is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations.

We are here, in my view, and I am trying to be as unbiased about this as possible, we are here basically for four reasons. First of all, because a budget deal was signed by the President and the congressional leadership 3 years ago which was a public lie. That budget promised that the Congress was going to make across-the-board cuts averaging 13 percent over 5 years' time in real terms. I said at the time that was a public lie, that the Congress would never do that to education or health care or defense, and I think events have demonstrated my criticism to be correct.

The second reason we are here is because, as Senator STEVENS noted in the conference yesterday, the Congress got behind by 3 months because it was busy trying to impeach the President and drive him from office. So that slowed us down by 3 months. Then we were slowed down another 6 months because our majority friends in the Republican Party tried to pass a tax bill that gave 70 percent of the benefits to the wealthiest 5 percent of people in this country, those folks who make over \$100,000 a year, and that huge tax got in the way of our being able to do anything to strengthen Social Security or Medicare or to add to our support for education and health care.

It also meant that they had no time to fix Social Security and no time to

fix Medicare, something the President asked us to do in his State of the Union message. Then the problem was compounded by the fact that the Republican majority added \$14 billion above the amount the Pentagon asked for, first for the supplemental that went through here a few months ago and then in the regular defense bill.

Having spent such a huge amount of money on Republican priorities, there was not then enough room in the budget to meet the President's priorities for land legacy, for smaller class size, for the social services block grant, and for cops on the beat and other programs that the President thinks are important.

Yet, to pretend that there was enough room in the budget to do all of the things that have been promised, our Republican friends invented some \$40 billion worth of gimmicks in their budget to pretend that they are not blowing money like crazy. They invented the 13-month concept. What they are saying is they are going to write checks for \$27 billion, but they are going to tell people: "Do not spend the money until after October 1 so that it will show up on the books for the next year rather than this year." That is simply a \$27 billion gimmick, which makes the budget look a lot better than it is.

Second, they then told the Congressional Budget Office, which is supposed to be our neutral scorekeeper, they have told them: "Boys and girls, just ignore what you really think these programs are going to really cost and simply tell us in your official bookkeeping that they are going to cost \$14 billion less than you think they are going to cost us. So that hides another \$14 billion.

Then what they have done is they have produced what they call "emergency" spending, because under our ridiculous budget rules if we call a program an emergency spending item then that spending does not count under the budget ceilings that we have imposed upon ourselves. In the past, we had gimmicks like that to the tune of about \$3 billion a year, and they were primarily for programmatic reasons because there were some programs like the low-income heating assistance where we needed to know a year in advance how much money we were going to spend, so we appropriated a year in advance.

But they have converted that advance appropriation device into a device simply to again hide massive amounts of spending, and this small chart I have here demonstrates that while we used to have about \$3 billion a year in that hidden advanced spending, in this year's budget that they are recommending we have \$27 billion. That sets a new record for irresponsible accounting, as far as I am concerned.

Then what they say, after they have done all of that and adopted all of those gimmicks to pretend that the budget gap is much smaller than it

really is, then they say: "Now we are going to jump across it with only a 1 percent cut and we are going to make everything sweet." That is like saying you can jump across the Grand Canyon because you define it as only 10 feet wide, but when they jump it is going to be a long fall, and I hope that is understood.

Now, what they are doing to cover their tracks is they are inventing this phony argument about Social Security. So the Republican Party that tried to kill Social Security in the cradle when it was first passed by President Roosevelt, the Republican Party that has tried to turn Medicare and Social Security over to the insurance companies by privatizing Social Security, the party that has for years tried to pass tax cuts which got in the way of our strengthening Social Security or Medicare—it in fact took money out of Medicare in order to pay for those tax cuts—that party is now claiming at this late date that it is somehow going to be a strong defender of Social Security.

I would like to say I think nothing is more appalling in this debate than the decline in the quality of debate as represented by the Social Security issue. The term "spending Social Security" could not be more misleading, and I would like to make a series of points that I do not think many people really dispute in order to show exactly how hollow this whole discussion really is.

First of all, no one is proposing spending any of the revenues collected for Social Security on anything other than Social Security beneficiaries, and they know it. If they assert otherwise, they are not telling the truth.

Second, the reserves in the Social Security Trust Fund are large and growing rapidly. At the end of last month, they exceeded \$850 billion. They are rapidly approaching a trillion dollars. They will be over a trillion dollars before Christmas of 2000. One hundred percent of those reserves are in U.S. securities, and my colleagues know it. Neither party is offering a proposal that would change where we invest our Social Security reserves at any time over the next decade. All Social Security reserves will continue to be invested in U.S. treasuries, and my colleagues know that.

This Government ran huge deficits in the '80s and '90s in the non-Social Security side of the budget, and they were so large that the entire budget, including Social Security surpluses, was in deficit. Overall public debt exploded during that period. The best measure of that is that public debt as a percentage of our total national income jumped from 26 percent to more than 50 percent between 1980 and the mid-1990s.

That forced us as a country to make huge, heavy annual interest payments that weakened our ability to eventually meet our obligations for a strong defense, for investments in science and education, and to see to it that we would be in good shape fiscally to pay

back Social Security when the baby-boomers retired.

I want to point something else out. Every budget submitted by Republican Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush, during the 12 years they held the White House, resulted in deficits in the non-Social Security side of the budget that exceeded the surplus in Social Security trust funds by a wide margin.

In 2 years, the Congress appropriated more money than Reagan and Bush requested, but in most years they appropriated less; and overall during those 12 years the Congress appropriated much less than they requested. That means that the on-budget deficits exceeded the surpluses in the Social Security Trust Fund for every one of those years. It means that those deficits can be directly attributed to the budget that they submitted and, again, my colleagues know that as well as I do.

In contrast, the budget submitted by this President has caused a dramatic reduction in the size of the on-budget deficits. In fiscal 1998 the on-budget deficit dropped to less than \$30 billion. Since the Social Security Trust Fund collected \$99 billion more than it paid out in that year, the overall unified government budget ran a \$69 billion surplus!

Social Security surpluses exceeded on-budget deficits by more than two-thirds in that year. That was the first time that Social Security surpluses were larger than the on-budget deficits since the reform of Social Security in 1980.

In fiscal 1999, the story got even better, and it is going to be even better next year. The fact is that when we end the baloney between both parties, what we are going to find out is that we will have over a 3-year period paid down the public debt by over \$250 billion, and despite all of the baloney and rhetoric to the contrary, that is the single best thing that will have happened to Social Security since Alan Greenspan and Claude Pepper saved it in the '80s by redrafting several provisions of the program.

So go ahead and cover the tracks if my colleagues want, or try as hard as they can. The fact is that the numbers indicate that good things, not bad things, are happening to Social Security. It has taken a long time for us to turn the corner on deficits; and what we ought to be doing is explaining to the American people in an honest way how we have gotten here and how we can make the situation even better rather than pretending that a crisis exists when, in fact, there is not one.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Westerville, Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to explain this to the American people in an honest way.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I frankly am not particularly interested today, although I do enjoy a good Doris Kearns historical piece on Presidents in the 1940s, I am not all that inter-

ested in for today's purposes in what happened in the 1940s or what happened in the 1970s or, frankly, what even happened in the 1980s, although I think it is pretty clear at least in the 1980s Ronald Reagan came to power and reduced marginal rates. Imagine this, some people in America were paying 70 percent of what they earned, the marginal rate of 70 percent of what they earned, to the Government.

He also brought a package to the floor in 1981 that not only reduced the taxes on the American people, reduced those marginal rates that were choking us, and we might remember we had that famous malaise speech by Jimmy Carter who said that the answer to America's problems were that we ought to get out of our cars and start riding bicycles, and we ought to turn our thermostats down and buy more sweaters and that we were in a period of malaise, and Reagan came in and said, no, I think if we cut taxes and cut spending, we, in fact, could get things moving again.

He did spend more money on defense. Thank God, he spent more money on defense, because just this last week I read an interview by Vaclav Havel in one of the current magazines, Vaclav Havel talking about freedom and liberty, and thank God we used a strong American defense to set people free, millions and millions of people who at one point it was only a dream that they could actually think freely, yet alone have the right to vote.

Nevertheless, I am not even concerned today about the 1980s. I am concerned about where we are today. In 1993, we began the fight to try to balance the budget. In 1997, I along with Senator DOMENICI and some folks from the White House, Erskine Bowles, John Hillely, who I give great credit to, put together a program that called for a balanced budget by 2002. I do not think we can take credit for all of the good economic news that we have today by a long shot, but I think it is clear that we contributed to the good economic news, contributed to lower interest rates in America, which has moved us far ahead of the curve to the point today where we have a unique opportunity to use the good news of budget surpluses in a way that can leverage everybody's futures, particularly those who are baby-boomers and baby-boomers' children.

□ 1115

What is the debate about today? I stayed pretty much out of this debate because it is he said, she said, more Washington talk, more reasons for people to pay attention to the movie actors that want to hold public office because they are so sick and tired of listening to us squawking and campaigning back and forth.

But I think the time has come, in light of the fact that the President is going to meet with congressional leadership today, to talk about what the debate is all about. It is really, frankly, pretty simple.

The question is, at the end of this fiscal year when we look back, will the Republicans have done something that has not been done before in my lifetime; and that is, not to take money out of the Social Security surplus. We are committed not to do that. We are committed to say that we will preserve all of the money being collected from Social Security.

Now, some people argue that that is really good for our senior citizens. Well, it is, rhetorically speaking. But our senior citizens are going to get their money. The beauty of the surplus in Social Security is it, number one, not only allows us to pay down some of the national debt, which we are doing aggressively, but it also gives us the opportunity to be in a position of where we can take these surpluses and use it to transform Social Security for three generations.

If we take the Social Security surplus and spend it on additional programs, we are putting the baby boomers and their children in a deep hole. In order to save Social Security and to transform it for three generations, we are going to need a lot of dollars.

Frankly, I have got a program that would save Social Security, but it would involve being able to take advantage of the huge surplus we have today for purposes of being able to set Americans free to control more of the Social Security taxes they pay.

Now, what does the President want to do? Well, the President, first of all, wants to raise some taxes. I have got to tell my colleagues the revenues in America are going to go up by 50 percent over the next 10 years. We do not need tax increases. Frankly, we need tax cuts, because conservatives believe we ought to run America from the bottom up, that the more money one has in one's pocket, the more power one has.

Let me just suggest for a second that we should not be raising taxes. I, hopefully, will come to the floor in a special order and talk about that. The issue is whether we will allow the President or people who like to spend in this town to take money out of the Social Security surplus. We are committed as a party to not doing it.

The proof will be in the pudding. If our appropriation bills move us into Social Security, we are going to cut them all across the board to keep us out of Social Security.

Why do we want to do this? We want to do this because, number one, we want to pay down debt. Number two, we want to save Social Security for three generations. Thirdly, we want to change our spending habits. We want to clean up the waste and the duplication and the institutional paralysis that has set into this city.

So as we go through this debate, my colleagues should keep their eye on the ball. The eye on the ball will mean this: Did the Republicans keep their word to keep us out of Social Security?

Will the President constantly push us to try to raid that Social Security fund. We ought not to raid it. It is not right for seniors today, and it is particularly not right for the baby boomers and their children tomorrow. We need to ensure a healthier and more stable economy for the United States.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the presentation of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on Budget. I tend to agree with him, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said earlier, that the who struck John and back and forth is really not of much interest to the American public.

But the budgets that people submit are of interest because they presumably do suggest policy. The chairman of the Committee on Budget historically has offered budgets, also when it was Democrats in charge and so that budget would not have been adopted, which suggested spending either all in the sense that we exceeded the Social Security surplus or most of the Social Security surplus in his own budgets submitted to the committee and/or the House.

It is not, I think, very useful as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, to pretend that, to date, we have not passed bills which, if ultimately enacted, would not spend Social Security revenues. They would in the sense that we would exceed the off Social Security surpluses in our total spending proposals.

What we are here today to do is pass a continuing resolution. We are here today to pass a continuing resolution which will give us one more week to try to complete our job. I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle who now talk about going down to the White House, I am pleased they are doing that.

But their leader about whom we have read so much recently said that, in effect, they were going to pass appropriation bills, hold the Labor, Health bill, and negotiate with the President with him on his knees.

I do not think the American public are interested in that kind of political discourse. I think they expect honest discussions between the White House and the Congress. I think they expect and deserve an honest treatment of this budget process, not threats, not pretense, not emergency funding which, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin, is now in the neighborhood of \$20 billion plus.

As my friend, the chairman of the committee, who in my opinion is supporting this policy, but is not the author of this policy, knows full well, it will have deep and drastic and adverse consequences next year.

So in the name of responsibility, we are creating a major problem in the

next year. Everybody on the Committee on Appropriations knows that. Everybody who knows anything about the budget knows that to be the case.

The fact of the matter is Social Security is in better shape now because of, frankly, the 1990 budget agreement, the 1993 budget agreement, and, yes, the 1997 agreement.

But let me say something about the 1997 agreement that has become the Holy Grail. The premise was we would still be in deficit today of the 1997 agreement. We were wrong. Happily, we were wrong. We have done much better than we thought we were going to do. We are in surplus, not in deficit.

So the premise underlying the 1997 agreement is not presently applicable. That does not mean, therefore, that we ought to prolifically spend. We ought not to.

But in fact, the President of the United States in February came to this House and said we are going to be paying down a substantial portion of our surplus on the national debt, the first time it has been done.

Ronald Reagan and George Bush asked us to spend more money than we spent in those 12 years. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that. I reiterate it. No one on the floor denies it because it is the fact.

So that in terms of all this fiscal discipline that we hear about from our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, that may be, but their Presidents, Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush, whom I supported in many of their policies, in particular their build up of defense, which I thought was appropriate, signed every nickel that was spent. We never overwrote a veto to spend more money. Never. Never.

The gentlemen on the Republican side say, well, the President will not let us do this, so the President is doing this, that, and the other because he vetoes it. Yes, that it is true. The President has a lot of power. Ronald Reagan signed every nickel that was spent and put us \$4 trillion in additional debt. Were we responsible? Yes, we were. But, clearly, it could not have been done without Reagan's and Bush's signatures.

In 1990, we adopted a program. In 1993, without any Republican help, we adopted another program. As a direct and proximate result, we have a surplus. Let us deal with it responsibly.

I am going to vote for this CR to give us another 8 days. But let us go down and discuss with the President positively and productively, not in a way that tries to bring the President or the Congress to its knees. The American public does not want us there. They do not deserve to have us there.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished and hardworking gentleman from Scottsdale, Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). I am so glad he abstained from the who struck John argument of historical revision. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is, not who is going to drive whom to their knees. The question before us today is this: Are we going to continue to cut the American people off at their knees in terms of asking for more and more of their money, in terms of going back to these old habits of spending, saying that the 1997 agreement was predicated on the notion that surpluses would not be as plentiful so now all bets are off?

I listened with interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) whom I have a great deal of respect, and while he bemoaned the quality of congressional debate, I must tell him and my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the question I hear from my constituents has to do with the sanctity and safety of Social Security.

We have made history. As the Congressional Budget Office pointed out, for the first time since 1960, this Congress was able to generate a surplus and not use a dime of the Social Security surplus. Let us continue that. Support the rule. Support the continuing resolution. Let us work together.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that we could yield all of the time available to Democrats this morning to our Republican colleagues, and they could talk all day long and not convince the American people that this is anything other than the most do little, do nothing Congress since Harry Truman's day. In the words of one distinguished congressional historian, this Congress has a "rendezvous with obscurity."

This Congress has wasted its time. It has wasted the time and the hopes of the American people. It has not done its work. There are many examples that can be cited of that, but let me give my colleagues just two.

There is one piece of legislation that this body must consider every year, and that piece of legislation provides the Federal funds to assure that our children have an opportunity to participate in the Head Start program. It provides the funding for the United States Department of Education.

True, until recent months, the Republican majority in this House had as a top objective to abolish the Department of Education and the Federal commitment to education. But now,

hopefully, they support it. I suppose that they support the educational technology funding in that bill, the funding for student financial assistance to give our young people who are willing to work to get a college education the opportunity to get that education. All of the funding for special education is continued in this measure.

It is this same bill that provides the Meals on Wheels program and other assistance to our seniors, that funds the National Institutes of Health, which conducts vital research that we are hearing from so many people across the country that they want to see upgraded with reference to cancer, with Parkinson's disease, with diabetes, with neurological disorders.

It is this same bill that funds the Children's Health Insurance Initiative that is so important to reach the millions of our youngest citizens who do not have any health insurance. Of course, this bill also provides the funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

This piece of legislation is a very interesting piece of legislation because it is not really caught up in the conflict between the President and the Republican leadership. The President does not schedule bills in this House. The President does not have a vote in this House. We find ourselves today with the fiscal year having ended, having another 3 weeks, and this Republican leadership, which is so boastful and so proud of their successes this morning, has not brought the bill that does all these things to the floor.

It has never even given the House of Representatives an opportunity to consider and debate the bill that deals with all of these vital national issues. It has no one, absolutely no one but itself to blame for having failed to provide us an opportunity to consider this bill.

Let me add that, though they are here asking for yet another week to address this issue, they still have not even scheduled consideration of this important bill. That is not the fault of the President of the United States. It is certainly not the fault of the Democratic minority that stands here ready to consider this issue. It is quite clearly the sole responsibility of the Republican leadership that chose, on education, on health care, to never even bring to the floor of the House this piece of legislation.

□ 1130

They had a whole year to do it. They had an additional 3 weeks to do it. And here we are near Halloween, and we have yet to have either trick or treat. We have no bill even scheduled to address that issue.

Let me give example number two. Some of us feel that a key to the economic success of this country has been technology, and that the research and development tax credit is helping provide opportunity for America to have more research, more emphasis on tech-

nology in this country and thereby more good jobs.

I was across the hall here a few weeks ago in the Ways and Means Committee considering the extension of that research and development credit. Of course, we Democrats had already offered to the House a fully-paid, not robbing grandmother's and grandfather's Social Security, but a fully-paid research and development tax credit on a permanent basis. And yet here we find ourselves months after that credit expired and the Republicans, once again, have failed to present it to the House. They have failed to present that research and development tax credit to the House.

The only gap in the availability of this important credit in its history was during this Republican leadership, back in 1996. Yet we find ourselves today with even a Republican lobbyist saying in today's paper that they think that credit is "in serious jeopardy." Once again, like the funding for education and health, Republicans do not even have the measure to extend the research and development tax credit on the schedule of this House.

If this continuing resolution is only going to continue the same kind of inaction that the Republicans have given us for the last 3 weeks and for the last few years, we are going to find ourselves right back here in another week debating the same thing.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell my friend, as he and my Democratic colleagues know very well, the R&D tax credit was in the bill the President vetoed, and the President requested \$34.7 billion for education, the Labor-HHS bill has \$35 billion for education.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the leader of the theme team.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am also confused by the comments of the previous speaker. The bill to which he is referring to that funds Head Start and so many valuable education programs is included in this continuing resolution, which we will be voting on today. And I certainly hope, in the name of the children and those programs, he plans to vote in the affirmative.

I am further confused when he talks about no achievements by this Congress. We passed the lockbox, and because of the lockbox, which says we will not spend Social Security funds for anything but Social Security. For the first time in history this Congress, or at least first time in recent history, this Congress, and this chart shows it, has not spent any Social Security funds on anything but Social Security.

Now, in contrast, the President of the United States said in January let us make Social Security the number one priority and has yet to introduce a

bill. So I would ask my Democrat friends where their bill is. I know there is a lot of lockstep going on over there with the White House, but where is their bill? If they are concerned about Social Security, where is their bill?

The Educational Flexibility Act, giving teachers in the classrooms more control and bureaucrats in Washington less control, we passed that. That probably was offensive to many of these Democrats. Missile defense system, protecting the United States of America, passed by this House. Probably nothing big to Democrats. A 4.8 percent pay raise for our military people, trying to close the 13 percent pay gap, which has done nothing but grow under the current anti-military administration. No problem, because these folks do not like that kind of thing.

What I also do not understand is why the Democrats want to give the executive branch so much more power over the legislative branch. I can see maybe for partisan reasons why they have to go with the President sometimes, but they go with the President every time. They need to stand up. They represent districts, not the White House. I think they should go back to their districts, and if people say do whatever the President says, then they should keep acting the way they are. But I suspect that the folks in my Democrat friends' districts, just like mine, do not send me to Washington to be a one-party water carrier. They want us to do what is best for them and what is best for the United States. But here my friends go really abdicating their power as legislators and giving it willingly to the executive branch in the name of party politics.

We made a budget agreement in 1997. Now, an agreement, by definition, has to have two parties. And we all popped corks, drank champagne, hugged each other, Democrat and Republican, brotherly love and all that over at the White House, and said we have a budget agreement. And I will say this, the gentleman from Wisconsin did not vote for that agreement, neither did I, but the majority of Democrats, the majority of Republicans did, and the White House signed off on it. Why is it now only up to the Republicans to carry on this agreement? Why can the Democrats not live up to what they said they were going to do in 1997? Why are we having this dialogue? Why are we having this fight?

Let us get over Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Guilty as charged. The deficit went up. And as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, it is the responsibility of the Democrat Congress. But let us do what we can today for 1999 and the year 2000. Let us balance the budget and not do it out of Social Security.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Louisville, Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), a very, very distinguished colleague and a hard working member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join in this debate. I had not really intended to do it until I looked at the monitor in my office and heard the claim that we all know that every single penny of Social Security that has been spent is backed up by a treasury bond. I had to come over and say that that would matter. That would be important if there was an asset to back up those IOUs that we have put into Social Security.

The truth is, there are no assets to back up the Social Security IOUs of \$1 billion that we are going to get to in the year 2000. The fact is that we have no intention of ever selling off one of our schools, selling off one of our locks and dams, selling off any of the assets to cash in those bonds. The fact is that there are no assets to back them up.

This would be just like me, the mother of six children, taking my children's college tuition and putting in an IOU in their college fund and going out and buying new clothes and saying that I am leaving them with an IOU. For what? I cannot sell off my clothes to pay off their tuition someday. And that is what we have done in Social Security. We have put in an IOU and we have spent it on programs, one program after another, all of which, when the money disappears, there is no way of recapturing it. There is no asset we can hold on to and that we can hand back to our kids in the year 2010 when we start needing to spend more than we are taking in.

Instead, we are going to have to look at my six children and all of the rest of our children and tell them that we need them to pay more taxes this year and more the next year and more. And we are going to expect them not only to pay all that Social Security money back, we are going to expect them to keep all the new programs that we have started going too, not just the programs we have now, but any one of the new 40, 60, 80 programs that this administration and our Democratic colleagues have asked us to fund.

So we are asking our kids to do two things: fill up the Social Security bank that we have raided and keep all these programs that we started going with tax dollars they do not have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) to make at least one more salient, important point.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I thought we were running out of time here; but I would like an opportunity to also talk as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and what it is like to be on appropriations this year and move bills through.

From the very first day of this year when we started talking about 302(b) allocations, that is the amount that we are allowed to spend, we had our Democratic colleagues saying, Oh, come on, you know we're going to spend more than this. Oh, come on, you know we can't stay within these caps. Oh, you know we're going to spend more. It was

like constant taunting every single day. Yet we quietly passed the bills as best we could.

But one of the previous speakers is correct, we have a very narrow margin, and it means that we are constantly building a consensus on this side of the aisle. And every day it was no help. It was sort of like someone might treat an alcoholic that is reformed by saying, Come on, have a drink. Have a drink. You know you're going to have a drink sooner or later. Why have this pain for 6 months and then finally give in; let us go on and lift these budget caps now. But we have worked as hard as we can and as straightforward as we can.

I want to say the other thing that I heard every step of the way, which is could we please have one more day before we bring things to the floor. One member of Appropriations after another has walked up here and suggested that we should be more family friendly and that we should finish at 6 o'clock so that everybody can go home. We have had one Member after another saying why are we staying over till Friday when we could do this next week when we come back; people complaining because we are here on Mondays in these debates and trying to pass these bills.

So every day, every day for 6 months, it has been let us put it off until next week; could we have more time for amendments. And to now come in and criticize that we have not finished all these bills already, when we have to depend on 218 votes out of our very slim majority, is very difficult. So I want to congratulate our chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who, with a very calm demeanor and a confidence that if good people of good will put their heads together, they can find a good solution, hung in there and got us this close to the finish.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Langley, Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is currently involved in a rather new debate over protection of the Social Security surpluses, a debate that Republicans initiated at the beginning of this Congress.

Secondly, for the past 30 years, Congress and the President have been using surpluses from the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the deficit in the overall Federal budget. All but 4 of these years the Democrats controlled the Congress.

Third, it is the Republicans who have proposed and passed overwhelmingly in the House the Social Security lockbox, which Democrats in the Senate are filibustering.

Fourth, Democrats are using fancy accounting in their own accusations. They add up everything that the House and Senate have passed this year rather than everything that has been enacted this year.

My Democrat friends know that not a penny can be spent until it is enacted, and that requires approval of

both Houses of Congress and the President. As is usual in the budget process, there are many demands on the limited amount of Federal dollars which the legislative process sifts through, setting priorities and spending no more than is allowable under the law.

At the end of the day, the Congress will pass all appropriations bills without dipping into the Social Security surplus.

□ 1145

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will you kindly inform both myself and my chairman how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make three points in closing.

First of all, we continue to hear the fiction that our good friends on the majority side of the aisle have not yet "invaded" the Social Security Trust Fund.

The Congressional Budget Office, as my colleagues know, is the agency that is charged with the responsibility to keep them honest and to keep us honest, on both sides of the aisle. They are supposed to estimate what our actions have cost. If we take a look at their web site and if we print it out, this information will appear on page 13. If we take a look at their web site entitled "Congressional Budget Office's Current Status of Discretionary Appropriations," we will see about two-thirds the way down the page under the title Addendum that, without the gimmicks of directed scoring, which hide at least \$12 billion, that we have current status of spending totaling \$606.6 billion for appropriation bills. That does not include any of the increases that the conference has put into the Labor, Health, Education bill.

That compares to the \$592 billion, which is the amount that the Congress can spend without touching the Social Security surplus. That means, in plain English and in plain mathematics, that counting what they have done with the earned income tax credit, they have in their terms "invaded" the Social Security surplus to the tune of \$14 billion. And if they eliminate the earned income tax credit action, which their side says it intends to do, then they have invaded it to the tune of \$23 billion.

Now, that is a fact; and all the hops, skips, and jumps that they perform cannot hide that fact.

Second, I would simply respond to the previous speaker, who said that the reason that the House is in such a mess on our budget issues is because they

only have a few votes above 218 so they have such a narrow margin that it is understandable that they have had to struggle.

I would point out that there are 435 votes to be had in this House, not 218. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) correctly recognized that. And that is why on the supplemental which he first brought to the committee and on the first four appropriations bills which he first brought to the committee, we had bipartisan agreements on those bills and those bills were not just going to receive 218 votes, they were going to receive at least 300 votes because a lot of us were going to vote for them.

But then what happened is the process got hijacked. It got hijacked by their majority whip, who decided that they were not being confrontational enough. And it got hijacked by the confrontational element in their caucus personified by, among others, the gentleman from Oklahoma. And when all was said and done, they took five bills in a row which started out to be partisan and turned them into partisan vehicles which we can no longer support because they unilaterally made changes in those bills, and they disregarded the President's priorities in the process.

In my view, when this is all said and done, there is only one way this is going to be worked out. That is that, in the end, they are going to have to sit down with us and with the White House, they are going to have to give respectful attention to the President's priorities, and we are going to have to give respectful attention to their priorities. That is the only way in the end that adults settle their differences.

So what I would suggest we do is pass this continuing resolution, quit the prattle and get on with the process of actually working out those differences.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, in strong support of this rule; and I am here to say that we, in fact, are meeting our constitutional obligations.

In my opening statement, I talked about the fact that we are ahead of schedule. We are ahead of schedule because, if we look at the number of years that we have had to go well into Christmas before we had settled the appropriations bills, there are numerous times when we have had to do that.

We are looking today at a one-week extension going to the 29th of October. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. YOUNG) has worked long and hard, and we are trying to have a bipartisan consensus here. We vetted this continuing resolution with our friends in the other body, with the White House. So we are simply proceeding with what is the proper constitutional role for dealing with our important work of completing these 13 bills.

So I urge my colleagues to support it. We have a chance to make history here by making sure that we do not go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are working very hard to ensure that that does not happen, that we do not go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

I hope my colleagues will first support this rule and then support the continuing resolution so that we can get this work down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 334, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 71 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106(c) of Public Law 106-62 is amended by striking "October 21, 1999" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 29, 1999". Notwithstanding section 106 of Public Law 106-62, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1, 1999, may continue to be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 334, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.J. Res. 71.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in support of H.J. Res. 71.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean continuing resolution that would extend the present CR until October 29. In addition, it includes a provision so that affected Government agencies would have the authority to develop, prepare, and make the November monthly payments for mandatory programs such as Social Security and veterans' pensions.

This is necessary because this CR extension will expire near the end of the month and financial managers will not be able to begin their payment process without the assurance that the funds will be available to make the payments.

That is the CR, pure and simple, Mr. Speaker. We need the additional time. We have several vetoes from the President that we are dealing with. The balance of the appropriations bills that have not been on the President's desk will be there very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, since we have made all of our political speeches during the consideration of the rule, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this continuing resolution in order to keep the Government open. But I am also here to remark on the sorry state of affairs that this Congress finds itself in.

We have a Republican majority unable to get its work done resorting to accounting gimmicks to cover their tracks and to hide the fact that they have already dipped into Social Security. And they would like to cover that up.

The facts would seem undeniable. The Republicans' own Congressional Budget Office has already confirmed that the majority has spent up to \$13 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund this year. A more recent estimation puts the raid on Social Security at \$24 billion. But Republicans deny these facts and instead have embarked on a cynical strategy to pretend that their goal is to protect Social Security.

It will not work because the American people are smart and they can spot a political ploy a mile away. They know that asking the Republican majority to safeguard Social Security is like asking the fox to watch the hen house.

Yesterday it was the majority leader who led Republicans in that mantra to protect Social Security, the very same majority leader who in 1984 called Social Security "a bad retirement" and a "rotten trick" on the American people, the same majority leader who once said "I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over a period of time."

Well, one might say that that was 15 years ago and maybe he has changed his mind on Social Security. Give the guy a break.

Okay, let us fast forward to 1994 when the majority leader said this about Social Security: "I would never have created Social Security."

Privatizing Social Security has been a long-held goal of the majority leader and other Republican leaders. Now they want the American people to believe that this budget impasse is because they want to save Social Security.

This budget impasse has nothing to do with Social Security. This budget impasse has to do with the Republican majority's true goal, to pass a massive tax cut that goes directly and primarily to the wealthiest Americans.

That is why we cannot meet our obligations to our children, our parents, our teachers, our veterans, because Republicans have other plans for that money, a tax cut to bring comfort to the comfortable.

After all, there are people out there who need to remodel their yachts. There are corporate CEOs who just cannot eke by on their \$10 million a year in salaries. That is who the Republican tax cut and budget would help. And to use senior citizens and Social Security as a smoke screen is shameful.

A few months ago, a bipartisan majority in this House voted to lock up the Social Security Trust Fund. Now this Republican majority has picked the lock on the lockbox.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what is important is not what happened yesterday, it is what should happen today and tomorrow. But before I get to that, I just want to address one comment made by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), in comparing who has done what in achieving previous completion on budget action.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has pointed with great pride to what happened in fiscal year 1997 as proof that in those days the Republican majority finished all of its bills on time. That is, in fact, the reverse of what happened.

What happened in 1997 is that they had a huge train wreck early and the damage was so bad that they simply gave up trying to legislate normally.

If we read the Congressional Quarterly account of what happened that year, I assume people think that is a neutral account, we will see in the 1996 almanac on page 10-21 that Congressional Quarterly indicates that "When Republicans returned from their August break after Labor Day, it was far from clear how or whether they could get their spending bills enacted by the start of the fiscal year.

□ 1200

"At that point only one fiscal 1997 spending bill, for agriculture, had become law. GOP troubles extended beyond deep disagreements with Clinton. For one thing, Republicans had difficulty among themselves settling on a game plan."

It goes on to discuss what happened, and what happened was very simply this: Five appropriation bills never went to conference. Those five bills wound up being wrapped into one overall omnibus appropriation, the base bill of which was the defense bill. What happened is the Republican majority, in the words of CQ, was so anxious to get home for reelection that they simply wrapped it all up in a one big huge package and went home.

To call that a model of orderly process is indeed turning reality on its

head. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the House.

We have a problem here. I think that problem is rooted in two factors. Number one, we have had the Republican majority fashion most of their appropriation bills in such a way that it would allow them to pretend this year that they had room for a giant tax cut, and they went home in August and found out that the public understood that that in fact was not the case, the public had other priorities, such as education, fixing Social Security and fixing Medicare. Yet what has happened is because this House spent so much time trying to pass that tax bill, we have appropriation bills that still have not become law.

Secondly, we are operating under a budget agreement in 1997 that in my view was the largest public fib in the history of this Congress, going back to 1981 when we had another very large public fib on budgeting. The problem is that 1997 deal promised that this Congress was going to make reductions in spending that it in fact has never been willing to make under the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. And as a result what has happened is that today we are struggling under a massive fiction. That massive fiction is that we have spent about \$40 billion less than we have actually spent in the appropriation bills. And so now, in a desperate effort to cover up that fact, the House leadership is trying to divert attention to a phony Social Security debate that does not in fact exist in the real world.

In my view we have two choices: We can continue to pass continuing resolutions once a week that are monuments to our own impotence, or we can simply get down to business and decide we are going to toss aside the phoniness and the fiction and get to the reality. The reality is not have we met each other's accounting standards. The reality is not how much political damage can we do to each other. The reality that we ought to be concerned about is what are we doing in an honest fashion to attack the education problems facing this country, to attack the health care needs facing this country, to attack the science research problems facing this country, to defend the country's national interest through both the defense budget, which is the military side of our foreign policy influence, and what we are doing to advance our national interest diplomatically through the other parts of our foreign policy effort.

The sooner we come to honest agreements about that, the sooner we can all quit this sterile debate and get on with the business of being legislators rather than politicians. That is what I would respectfully hope that we do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During the consideration of the rule, the House heard a lot of political rhetoric, some of which was fairly accurate, some of which had no accuracy whatsoever. But I am not here today to fight a political battle. That is for the campaign trail. I am here today to do the people's business. They want their business done. That is what we are doing. We are moving appropriations bills through this process. It is not easy. This is the smallest majority that any majority party has had in the House for nearly 50 years. So of course it has not been easy, especially when the President is of a different party than the majority in the House.

But this is not the place to fight out those battles. Today we extend the continuing resolution until the 29th of October, so that the government can continue to function and that the people who work for the government can continue to get paid, and the obligations that our government has continue to be met. We can do our campaigning at another time, at another place. We were not sent to do our campaigning in this chamber. We were sent to do the people's business.

And so I would ask for support of this continuing resolution so that we can have those meetings with the President, so that we can have those conference reports sent to the President's desk, so that we can get the President's vetoes and that we can deal with the vetoes and try to reach an accommodation with the President, because he plays a constitutional role in this issue, although somewhat belatedly. I recall having asked him back in April if he would be willing to get engaged in this budget process and received no answer to this day. But, anyway, I would hope that the House will approve the CR so that we can get on with the balance of the people's business.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 334, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	DeLauro	Isakson
Ackerman	DeLay	Istook
Aderholt	DeMint	Jackson (IL)
Allen	Deutscher	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	(TX)
Archer	Dickey	Jenkins
Armey	Dicks	John
Bachus	Dingell	Johnson, E.B.
Baird	Dixon	Johnson, Sam
Baker	Doggett	Jones (NC)
Baldacci	Dooley	Jones (OH)
Baldwin	Doolittle	Kanjorski
Ballenger	Doyle	Kaptur
Barcia	Dreier	Kasich
Barr	Duncan	Kelly
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Kennedy
Barrett (WI)	Edwards	Kildee
Bartlett	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Barton	Ehrlich	Kind (WI)
Bass	Emerson	King (NY)
Bateman	Engel	Kingston
Becerra	English	Kleczka
Bentsen	Eshoo	Klink
Bereuter	Etheridge	Knollenberg
Berkley	Evans	Kolbe
Berman	Everett	Kucinich
Berry	Ewing	Kuykendall
Biggett	Farr	LaHood
Bilbray	Fattah	Lampson
Bilirakis	Filner	Lantos
Bishop	Fletcher	Largent
Blagojevich	Foley	Larson
Bliley	Forbes	Latham
Blumenauer	Ford	LaTourette
Blunt	Fossella	Leach
Boehlert	Fowler	Lee
Boehner	Frank (MA)	Levin
Bonilla	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Bonior	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Frost	Linder
Borski	Galleghy	Lipinski
Boswell	Ganske	LoBiondo
Boucher	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Boyd	Gekas	Lowey
Brady (PA)	Gephardt	Lucas (KY)
Brady (TX)	Gibbons	Lucas (OK)
Brown (FL)	Gilchrest	Luther
Brown (OH)	Gillmor	Maloney (CT)
Bryant	Gilman	Maloney (NY)
Burr	Gonzalez	Manzullo
Burton	Goode	Markey
Callahan	Goodlatte	Mascara
Calvert	Goodling	Matsui
Campbell	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Canady	Goss	McCarthy (NY)
Cannon	Graham	McCollum
Capps	Granger	McCrery
Capuano	Green (WI)	McDermott
Cardin	Greenwood	McGovern
Carson	Gutierrez	McHugh
Castle	Gutknecht	McInnis
Chabot	Hall (OH)	McIntosh
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	McIntyre
Chenoweth-Hage	Hansen	McKeon
Clay	Hastert	McKinney
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Clyburn	Hayes	Meek (FL)
Coble	Hayworth	Meeks (NY)
Coburn	Hefley	Menendez
Collins	Herger	Metcalfe
Combest	Hill (IN)	Mica
Condit	Hill (MT)	Millender-
Conyers	Hilleary	McDonald
Cook	Hilliard	Miller (FL)
Cooksey	Hinchee	Miller, Gary
Costello	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Cox	Hobson	Minge
Coyne	Hoeffel	Mink
Cramer	Hoekstra	Moakley
Crane	Holden	Mollohan
Crowley	Holt	Moore
Cubin	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Cummings	Horn	Moran (VA)
Cunningham	Hostettler	Morella
Danner	Houghton	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Hoyer	Myrick
Davis (IL)	Hulshof	Nadler
Davis (VA)	Hunter	Napolitano
Deal	Hutchinson	Neal
DeGette	Hyde	Nethercutt
Delahunt	Inslee	

Ney	Royce	Tanner
Northup	Ryan (WI)	Tauscher
Norwood	Ryun (KS)	Tauzin
Nussle	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Oberstar	Salmon	Taylor (NC)
Obey	Sanchez	Terry
Olver	Sanders	Thomas
Ortiz	Sandlin	Thompson (CA)
Ose	Sanford	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Sawyer	Thornberry
Oxley	Saxton	Thune
Packard	Schaffer	Thurman
Pallone	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Pascrell	Scott	Tierney
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Payne	Serrano	Towns
Pease	Sessions	Trafigant
Pelosi	Shadeegg	Turner
Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Udall (CO)
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Udall (NM)
Petri	Sherman	Upton
Phelps	Sherwood	Velazquez
Pickering	Shimkus	Vento
Pickett	Shows	Visclosky
Pitts	Shuster	Vitter
Pombo	Simpson	Walden
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Walsh
Porter	Skeen	Wamp
Portman	Skelton	Waters
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Watkins
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Ramstad	Snyder	Weldon (FL)
Rangel	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Regula	Spence	Weller
Reyes	Spratt	Wexler
Reynolds	Stabenow	Weygand
Riley	Stark	Whitfield
Rivers	Stearns	Wicker
Rodriguez	Stenholm	Wilson
Roemer	Strickland	Wise
Rogan	Stump	Wolf
Rogers	Stupak	Woolsey
Rohrabacher	Sununu	Wu
Rothman	Sweeney	Wynn
Roukema	Talent	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	Tancredo	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

DeFazio

Paul

NOT VOTING—11

Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	LaFalce	Rush
Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Scarborough
Jefferson	Martinez	

□ 1242

So the joint resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any rollcall vote on H.R. 3885, providing discretionary spending offsets for fiscal year 2000, will be taken after debate has been concluded on that motion.

Rollcall votes on any other motions will be postponed until after debate has been concluded on those motions.